

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



A 49.9  
R 31. a  
ARS 44-13  
1965

ARS 44-13  
DECEMBER 1965

# TURKEY

## PERFORMANCE TESTS 1965

Report of Central Turkey Meat  
Production Tests and  
Statistical Analysis of  
Performance Records

Agricultural Research Service  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE



## FOREWORD

This publication includes reports of results from each of three turkey meat production tests conducted in 1965. In Minnesota, North Dakota, and Pennsylvania, the tests followed the procedures for central turkey meat production tests as provided in the National Turkey Improvement Plan. The detailed provisions for the tests are contained in USDA Miscellaneous Publication No. 739. Copies of this publication may be obtained from Official State Agencies for the National Turkey Improvement Plan or by writing directly to the Poultry Research Branch, AH Division, Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Maryland 20705.

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Testing Procedures . . . . .	2-3
Evaluation of Results . . . . .	3
Statistical Significance of Differences . . . . .	3
Explanation of Terms and Abbreviations . . . . .	4
Entrants in 1965 Central Turkey Meat Production Tests. . . . .	4-5
1965 Turkey Meat Production Tests and Supervisors . . . . .	5
Minnesota Central Random Sample Turkey Meat Production Test . . . . .	6-7
North Dakota Central Random Sample Turkey Meat Production Test . . . . .	8-9
Central Random Sample Turkey Meat Production Test of Pennsylvania . . . . .	10-12

Information in this report was compiled by the Animal Husbandry Research Division, Agricultural Research Service, from data supplied by the Test Supervisors. The Statistical Analysis was made by Biometrical Services, ARS. The publication of this report should not be construed as implying approval or endorsement by the U. S. Department of Agriculture of any of the stocks tested.

TESTING PROCEDURES

The procedures followed in each test were such as to provide equal environment for each entry, but there were variations in test facilities and the details of the methods used. Some of the variations between these tests were as follows:

Sampling: The same methods were used by all tests in obtaining the sample of poults for the entries. A representative of the entrant's Official State Agency selected a sample of eggs from a supply being used to produce poults of the stock entered. A prescribed method of randomization to provide a sample that was typical of the entire supply was followed. The eggs from all entrants in each test were set in the same incubators and, from the salable poults hatched, 100 were selected at random as the entry. The poults were then individually identified by wing bands.

In a few cases, the egg sample did not produce enough salable poults and the entry started with less than 100 birds. However, since the performance data were collected on an individual bird basis, these variations gave no advantage or handicap to the affected entries in the final results.

Housing: In the Pennsylvania and Minnesota tests, the poults from all entries were intermingled under the brooders. In Pennsylvania, the entries and sexes were separated at 6 weeks. In Minnesota, the entries were separated at 6 weeks of age. Each entry was then divided into two lots of equal numbers of toms and hens and maintained in replicate pens for the remainder of the test. In North Dakota, the poults were separated by entry and sexes. The toms and hens for each entry were maintained in replicate pens throughout the test.

Growing Periods: There were variations between tests in the length of the growing periods. The growing periods for hens varied from 20 to 21 weeks and, for toms, from 24 to 25 weeks. The age of the birds at the time the test was terminated is indicated in each test report as the age for the final live weights. In the Pennsylvania test, the toms of one entry, a small, early maturing stock, were dressed 3 weeks earlier than the toms in other entries. The data for this entry (No. 13) were not included in the computation of test averages or the analysis for the significance of differences.

Mortality: The mortality figures reported were based on the number of birds started and are accumulative for the periods indicated.

Live Weights: In each test, the birds were weighed individually at 12 weeks of age and again just before killing. The birds were also weighed at 6 weeks of age in the Pennsylvania test, and at 6 and 18 weeks of age in the Minnesota test.

Eviscerated Weights: The eviscerated weights reported are the weights of the fully dressed carcasses and include the weight of neck and giblets.

In Pennsylvania, the carcasses were weighed immediately after dressing, while in Minnesota and North Dakota, they were placed in chill tanks for several hours before weighing.

Body Measurements: There were also variations in the methods of making body measurements. The Minnesota test measured the live birds. The North Dakota and Pennsylvania tests measured at the New York dressed stage.

Defects: The specific defects, pendulous crop, roach back, leg weakness, and breast blisters, were recorded when observed at any time during the growing period or dressing process. However, only those defects that occurred on birds that subsequently died or were graded other than Grade A are included in the test report.



**Feed Conversion:** Feed efficiency was measured by all tests and was reported as the pounds of feed required to produce a pound of live turkey from one day of age to time of slaughter. Feed consumption per entry was estimated for the initial period prior to the separation of the entries. The estimated feed consumption per entry during the initial period was based on the feed conversion ratio of the intermingled unit and the weight of the entry at the end of the period. During the remainder of the test, the weight of feed consumed was recorded by entries.

The test reports include feed conversion ratios as computed by two methods. The results reported under Method 1 reflect the pounds of feed required to produce a pound of marketable turkey. This method of computation is most commonly used by commercial growers and is more likely to reflect the probable overall economic returns. However, in this method, the ability of the stock to convert feed to meat may be confounded by mortality which occurred during the growing period. Method 2 tends to eliminate the influence of mortality by adding to the weight of the marketable turkeys the weight at time of death of the birds that died before the end of the test.

### EVALUATION OF RESULTS

In the evaluation of the results, no direct comparison should be made between entries in different tests. Since differences in the performance of entries in different tests may be due to variations in testing procedures, direct comparisons of results reported in this summary should be made only between entries within a test.

In comparing entries, the possibility of differences due to chance alone should be recognized. Obviously, small differences may be due to chance rather than to a genetic difference in the stocks tested. However, differences should not be ignored solely because they are small, nor should larger differences be accepted as signifying genetic differences because they are large.

It would be difficult to determine precisely what part of the difference between two entries was due to a true genetic difference in the stocks and that which was due to chance alone. Statistical procedures may be applied to test data which will indicate the probability of similar differences occurring in subsequent tests. The NTIP provides that one of these procedures, such as Duncan's Multiple Range Test, be applied to central turkey meat production tests and the results included in the national summary.

### STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES

In applying Duncan's Multiple Range Test, the weights and measurements of each entry were compared to those of each other entry within a test. The differences occurring were tested to determine whether they were statistically significant. The results of the statistical analysis were reported in a line chart which was prepared as follows: (1) For each test and for each trait measured, the entry numbers (shown with the entrant's name in the tables of results) were arranged with the entry having the largest weight or measurement on the left and in descending order to the smallest on the right. (2) A line (underscore) was then drawn under the first entry number and was extended under the number of each entry which did not differ significantly from the first entry. (3) This procedure was followed for each entry in the test.

In the completed chart, those entries whose numbers are underscored by a common line were not significantly different. For example, in the following illustration, entry No. 3 was the largest but not significantly different from entries 5 and 2. Entry 5 was not significantly different from 3, 2, 4, or 9 but was significantly larger than 10, 8, 7, 1 and 6. Entry 6 was the smallest but was not significantly smaller than 7 or 1.

Entry No.	3	5	2	4	9	10	8	7	1	6
	<hr/>							<hr/>		

## EXPLANATION OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Entrant: In the tables of results, only the abbreviated names of the entrants and the State in which they are located are given. The complete names and addresses of all entrants appear below.

### Kind of Stock:

BBB - Broad Breasted Bronze  
BBW - Broad Breasted White  
MW - Midget White

BR - Breeder Replacement  
SF - Supply Flock

### Mating Procedure:

Nat. - Natural mating  
Art. - Artificial insemination  
Both - Natural mating, supplemented with artificial insemination

Feed Conversion: The figures reported represent the pounds of feed used to produce one pound of live turkey.

Method 1. Includes the weight of marketable turkeys only.

Method 2. Includes the weight of marketable turkeys, plus the weight at time of death of birds that died during the growing period and the final weight of other unmarketable birds.

Eviscerated Weight: The weight of the fully dressed birds, including the neck and giblets.

Eviscerated Yield: The eviscerated weight expressed as a percentage of the live weight.

### Body Measurements:

Breast Width - Measured at the widest point 1 3/4 inches above the keel.  
Body Depth - Measured at the deepest point.  
Keel Length - Measured as a straight line between the front and rear ends of the keel.

Defects: Percentage of birds with defects is computed from the number of birds started.

## ENTRANTS IN 1965 CENTRAL TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TESTS

Name and Address of Entrant	Variety	Strain or Trade Name	Mating Pro- cedure	Tests and Kind of Stock Entered		
				Minn.	N. Dak.	Penna.
Anderson Turkey Farm Belchertown, Massachusetts	BBB	Anderson Bronze	Art.			BR
Anderson Turkey Farm Belchertown, Massachusetts	BBW	Anderson Blockbuster	Art.			BR
Browning Turkey Farms Winchester, Kentucky	BBB	Browning	Both	SF	SF	SF
Browning Turkey Farms Winchester, Kentucky	BBW	Browning	Both	SF	SF	SF
Ephrata Turkey Farms, Inc. Ephrata, Pennsylvania	BBW	Ephrata White	Art.			SF
Ephrata Turkey Farms, Inc. Ephrata, Pennsylvania	BBW	Nicholas	Art.			SF
Gozzi Breeding Farms, Inc. Guilford, Connecticut	BBW	Gozzi 300	Both	SF		SF
Jaindl's Turkey Farm Allentown, Pennsylvania	BBB	Jaindl's Bronze	Art.			SF



ENTRANTS IN 1965 CENTRAL TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TESTS (Continued)

Name and Address of Entrant	Variety	Strain or Trade Name	Mating Pro- cedure	Tests and Kind of Stock Entered		
				Minn.	N. Dak.	Penna.
Janssen Farms Hatcheries, Inc. Zeeland, Michigan	BBB	Janssen Dutch Boy	Both	SF	SF	
Jerome Turkey Hatchery, Inc. Barron, Wisconsin	BBB	Superline Bronze	Both			BR
Jerome Turkey Hatchery, Inc. Barron, Wisconsin	BBW	Superline White	Both	SF	BR	BR
Koronis Mill Turkeys Paynesville, Minnesota	BBB	Koronis K-11	Art.	SF		
Schultz, Fred W. & Son Croton Falls, New York	BBW	Schultz Cross	Art.			SF
Shearer, Robert K. Reinholds, Pennsylvania	BBB	Shearer's Bronze	Art.			SF
Shearer, Robert K. Reinholds, Pennsylvania	MW	Shearer's Midget	Art.			SF
Tunnel Hatchery Langhorne, Pennsylvania	BBB	Tunnel Bronze	Art.			SF
Williams Turkey Farms Oakdale, California	BBB	Williams "Big W"	Both	SF	SF	SF
Williams Turkey Farms Oakdale, California	BBW	Williams "Big W"	Both	SF	SF	SF

1965 TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TESTS AND SUPERVISORS

Minnesota Central Random Sample Turkey Meat Production Test  
(Supervisor: Robert E. Moehrle, 430 State Office Building, St. Paul 55101)

North Dakota Central Random Sample Turkey Meat Production Test  
(Supervisor: Gary Rehovsky, N. D. Poultry Improvement Board, State  
Capitol, Bismarck 58501)

Central Random Sample Turkey Meat Production Test of Pennsylvania  
(Supervisor: Charles W. Dorsey, Dept. of Agriculture, Harrisburg 17120)

MINNESOTA CENTRAL RANDOM SAMPLE TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TEST

Entrant	Strain or Trade Name	Color	Mating Pro- cedure	Size Flock from which Sample Taken	Sex	Average Live Weight (lbs)					
						6 Weeks	12 Weeks	18 Weeks	21 Weeks	25 Weeks	25 Weeks
1. Browning Kentucky	Browning Bronze	B	Both	28,800	Toms Hens	2.7 2.3	9.9 7.6		20.1 14.2		27.7
2. Browning Kentucky	Browning White	W	Both	10,700	Toms Hens	2.7 2.2	9.9 7.4		20.9 14.3		28.2
3. Gozzi Connecticut	Gozzi Line 300	W	Both	5,000	Toms Hens	2.6 2.1	9.2 7.0		18.6 12.9		25.7
4. Janssen Michigan	Dutch Boy JB-763	B	Both	10,000	Toms Hens	2.5 2.1	9.4 7.3		20.4 14.6		28.4
5. Jerome Wisconsin	Super Line White	W	Both	18,000	Toms Hens	2.6 2.3	9.5 7.5		19.1 13.7		26.2
6. Koronis Minnesota	Koronis K-11	B	Art.	4,800	Toms Hens	2.7 2.2	10.1 7.9		20.4 16.0		29.1
7. Williams California	Williams "Big W"	B	Both	20,000	Toms Hens	2.9 2.3	10.1 7.9		20.8 14.8		27.8
8. Williams California	Williams "Big W"	W	Both	10,000	Toms Hens	2.7 2.4	9.9 7.7		20.3 14.5		27.2
Avg. Bronze Entries		B			Toms Hens	2.7 2.2	9.9 7.7		20.4 14.9		28.3
Avg. White Entries		W			Toms Hens	2.7 2.2	9.6 7.4		19.7 13.9		26.8
Average All Entries		B & W			Toms Hens	2.7 2.2	9.8 7.5		20.1 14.4		27.5

Statistical Significance of Differences Between Entries

Final Live Weight

Toms								
Entry No.	6	4	2	7	1	8	5	3
Hens								
Entry No.	6	7	4	8	2	1	5	3

Eviscerated Weight

Toms								
Entry No.	6	4	7	2	1	8	5	3
Hens								
Entry No.	6	7	8	4	2	1	5	3

Eviscerated Yield

Toms								
Entry No.	6	7	4	5	3	1	8	2
	<hr/>							
	<hr/>							
Hens								
Entry No.	6	8	1	5	4	3	2	7
	<hr/>							

MINNESOTA CENTRAL RANDOM SAMPLE TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TEST

Eviscerated		Feed Conversion		Breast	Body	Keel	Mortality			Percent with:				Entrant
Weight (lbs.)	Yield (%)	Method 1	Method 2	Width (In.)	Depth (In.)	Length (In.)	Weeks (%)	6 Weeks (%)	End Test (%)	Pendulous Corp	Roach Back	Leg Weakness	Breast Blisters	
21.9 12.0	79.3 85.0	3.62	3.51	4.2 3.6	9.5 7.5	7.6 5.9		1.7	4.0					1. Browning
22.2 12.0	78.8 83.9	3.55	3.46	4.4 3.6	9.3 7.5	7.6 6.1		2.6	6.0			4.2	3.8	2. Browning
20.4 10.9	79.5 84.4	3.48	3.46	4.0 3.5	9.2 7.3	7.4 5.9		2.6	3.0					3. Gozzi
22.9 12.3	80.5 84.5	3.58	3.51	4.6 3.7	9.6 7.5	7.4 5.8		2.6	3.0					4. Janssen
20.9 11.6	79.7 84.7	3.66	3.62	4.1 3.7	9.2 7.4	7.2 5.7		0.0	3.0	4.5				5. Jerome
23.6 13.7	81.1 85.5	3.42	3.34	4.5 3.9	9.4 7.6	7.2 6.0		3.5	7.0		9.5		4.9	6. Koronis
22.4 12.5	80.6 84.1	3.47	3.38	4.3 3.7	9.6 7.5	7.5 6.1		0.9	2.0					7. Williams
21.5 12.4	79.3 85.1	3.65	3.52	4.3 3.8	9.3 7.5	7.3 5.9		1.7	7.0	4.8	4.8			8. Williams
22.7 12.6	80.4 84.8	3.52	3.44	4.4 3.7	9.5 7.5	7.4 6.0		2.2	4.0		2.4		1.2	Avg. Bronze Entries
21.3 11.7	79.3 84.5	3.59	3.52	4.2 3.7	9.3 7.4	7.4 5.9		1.7	4.8	1.1 1.2	1.2	1.1	1.0	Avg. White Entries
22.0 12.2	79.9 84.7	3.55	3.47	4.3 3.7	9.4 7.5	7.4 5.9		2.0	4.4	0.6 0.6	1.8	0.5	1.1	Average All Entries

Statistical Significance of Differences Between Entries

Breast Width

Toms								
Entry No.	4	6	2	8	7	1	5	3
Hens								
Entry No.	6	8	7	5	4	2	1	3

Body Depth

Toms								
Entry No.	4	7	1	6	8	2	5	3
Hens								
Entry No.	6	8	7	4	2	1	5	3

Keel Length

Toms								
Entry No.	2	1	7	4	3	8	6	5
Hens								
Entry No.	7	2	6	8	3	1	4	5

## NORTH DAKOTA CENTRAL RANDOM SAMPLE TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TEST

Entrant	Strain or Trade Name	Color	Mating Procedure	Size Flock from which Sample Taken	Sex	Average Live Weight (lbs)					
						Weeks	12 Weeks	Weeks	20 Weeks	Weeks	24 Weeks
1. Browning Kentucky	Browning Bronze	B	Both	28,800	Toms Hens		10.8 8.8		21.5 15.8		27.4
2. Browning Kentucky	Browning White	W	Both	10,700	Toms Hens		11.0 8.5		22.1 15.4		28.0
3. Janssen Michigan	Janssen Dutch Boy	B	Art.	7,000	Toms Hens		11.3 9.2		23.1 16.2		29.0
4. Jerome Wisconsin	Superline White	W	Both	770	Toms Hens		10.5 8.6		21.5 15.5		27.5
5. Williams California	Williams "Big W"	B	Both	28,000	Toms Hens		11.2 8.7		23.0 16.4		29.3
6. Williams California	Williams "Big W"	W	Both	18,000	Toms Hens		11.1 8.7		22.3 15.4		27.9
Avg. Bronze Entries		B			Toms Hens		11.1 8.9		22.7 16.1		28.6
Avg. White Entries		W			Toms Hens		10.8 8.5		22.0 15.4		27.8
Avg. All Entries		B & W			Toms Hens		10.9 8.7		22.3 15.8		28.2

## Statistical Significance of Differences Between Entries

## Final Live Weight

Toms						
Entry No.	5	3	2	6	4	1
<hr/>						
Hens						
Entry No.	5	3	1	4	6	2
<hr/>						

## Eviscerated Weight

Toms						
Entry. No.	5	3	6	2	4	1
<hr/>						
Hens						
Entry. No.	5	3	1	4	6	2
<hr/>						

## Eviscerated Yield

Toms						
Entry. No.	6	5	4	3	1	2
<hr/>						
Hens						
Entry. No.	3	4	6	5	1	2
<hr/>						



## NORTH DAKOTA CENTRAL RANDOM SAMPLE TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TEST

Eviscerated Weight Yield (lbs.) (%)		Feed Conversion		Breast Width (In.)	Body Depth (In.)	Keel Length (In.)	Mortality			Percent with:				Entrant
		Method 1	Method 2				2 Weeks (%)	8 Weeks (%)	End of Test (%)	Pendu- lous Crop	Roach Back	Leg Weak- ness	Breast Blisters	
23.2	84.7		3.45	7.5	10.1	8.1								1.
13.3	84.4		3.71	6.0	7.7	6.7					2.2			Browning
23.3	83.3		3.76	7.8	9.9	8.0					2.7	2.7		2.
12.8	83.2		3.41	5.9	7.5	6.5								Browning
24.6	84.9		3.45	8.0	9.8	8.1	Data Not Reported	Data Not Reported	Data Not Reported				2.9	3.
13.8	85.3		3.27	6.3	7.6	6.5					2.1			Janssen
23.3	85.0		3.67	7.9	9.7	7.9								4.
13.1	84.7		3.29	6.2	7.5	6.5								Jerome
24.9	85.0		3.71	8.0	9.9	8.1								5.
13.9	84.4		3.32	6.2	7.7	6.6				2.6				Williams
23.8	85.0		3.60	7.9	9.8	7.9						3.1		6.
13.0	84.6		3.54	6.1	7.5	6.5				2.3				Williams
24.2	84.9		3.54	7.8	9.9	8.1							1.2	Avg. Bronze
13.7	84.7		3.42	6.2	7.7	6.6				0.8	1.5			Entries
23.5	84.4		3.68	7.9	9.8	7.9					1.9	1.9		Avg. White
13.0	84.2		3.41	6.1	7.5	6.5				0.8				Entries
23.9	84.7		3.62	7.9	9.9	8.0					1.1	1.1	0.5	Avg. All
13.3	84.4		3.42	6.1	7.6	6.6				0.8	0.8			Entries

## Statistical Significance of Differences Between Entries

## Breast Width

Toms					
Entry No.	5	3	6	4	2
					1

Hens					
Entry No.	3	5	4	6	1
					2

## Body Depth

Toms					
Entry No.	1	5	2	6	3
					4

Hens					
Entry No.	5	1	3	6	4
					2

## Keel Length

Toms					
Entry No.	5	3	1	2	6
					4

Hens					
Entry No.	1	5	6	4	3
					2



## CENTRAL RANDOM SAMPLE TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TEST OF PENNSYLVANIA

Entrant	Strain or Trade Name	Color	Mating Pro- cedure	Size Flock from which Sample Taken	Sex	Average Live Weight (lbs)					
						6 Weeks	Weeks	12 Weeks	Weeks	22 Weeks	25 Weeks
1. Anderson Massachusetts	Anderson Bronze	B	Art.	2,030	Toms Hens	2.6 2.2		11.3 9.2		19.0	32.4
2. Anderson Massachusetts	Anderson Blockbuster	W	Art.	1,530	Toms Hens	2.6 2.1		11.4 8.5		17.8	31.3
3. Browning Kentucky	Browning Bronze	B	Both	28,800	Toms Hens	2.7 2.3		11.0 8.8		16.7	29.8
4. Browning Kentucky	Browning White	W	Both	10,700	Toms Hens	2.7 2.2		10.5 8.4		15.9	28.1
5. Ephrata Pennsylvania	Ephrata White	W	Art.	10,000	Toms Hens	2.5 1.9		10.3 7.7		15.9	27.7
6. Ephrata Pennsylvania	Nicholas	W	Art.	10,000	Toms Hens	2.6 2.1		10.7 8.3		16.0	29.7
7. Gozzi Connecticut	Gozzi Line 300	W	Both	7,100	Toms Hens	2.7 2.2		11.4 8.8		17.5	32.0
8. Jaindl Pennsylvania	Jaindl's Bronze	B	Art.	4,500	Toms Hens	2.3 2.0		10.3 8.5		17.1	29.9
9. Jerome Wisconsin	Superline Bronze	B	Both	1,500	Toms Hens	2.4 2.1		10.3 8.4		16.5	29.2
10. Jerome Wisconsin	Superline White	W	Both	2,500	Toms Hens	2.4 2.1		10.2 7.8		16.3	28.4
11. Schultz New York	Schultz Cross	W	Art.	1,050	Toms Hens	2.3 1.8		9.8 7.5		15.6	28.7
12. Shearer Pennsylvania	Shearer Bronze	B	Art.	3,000	Toms Hens	2.2 2.0		9.9 8.2		16.5	27.2
13. Shearer Pennsylvania*	Shearer Midget	W	Art.	350	Toms Hens	2.1 1.7		8.0 6.1		18.7 11.3	
14. Tunnel Pennsylvania	Tunnel Bronze	B	Art.	2,000	Toms Hens	2.2 1.9		9.4 7.7		15.6	26.7
15. Williams California	Williams "Big W"	B	Both	15,000	Toms Hens	2.5 2.3		10.7 8.7		17.5	30.6
16. Williams California	Williams "Big W"	W	Both	9,000	Toms Hens	2.5 2.0		10.4 7.9		15.8	29.1
Avg. Bronze Entries		B			Toms Hens	2.4 2.1		10.4 8.5		17.0	29.4
Avg. White Entries		W			Toms Hens	2.5 2.1		10.6 8.1		16.3	29.4
Average All Entries		B & W			Toms Hens	2.5 2.1		10.5 8.3		16.6	29.4

\*Data from this entry were not included in the averages or in analysis for Significance of Difference.  
See explanation of Testing Procedures -- Growing Periods.

## CENTRAL RANDOM SAMPLE TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TEST OF PENNSYLVANIA

Eviscerated		Feed Conversion		Breast Width (In.)	Body Depth (In.)	Keel Length (In.)	Mortality			Percent with:				Entrant
Weight (lbs.)	Yield (%)	Method 1	Method 2				6 Weeks (%)	8 Weeks (%)	End Test (%)	Pendu- lous Corp	Roach Back	Leg Weak- ness	Breast Blisters	
27.1 15.8	83.6 82.7	3.55 3.59	3.54 3.50	6.8 6.7	8.7 6.8	7.7 7.0	0.8	0.8	5.6				16.7	1. Anderson
25.9 14.5	82.6 81.6	3.66 3.50	3.66 3.50	6.5 5.8	8.8 6.7	7.7 6.6	0.0	0.0	1.0					2. Anderson
24.0 13.4	81.1 80.4	3.90 3.86	3.87 3.86	5.8 5.6	8.8 6.7	7.8 6.7	1.2	1.2	2.2				6.4	3. Browning
23.0 12.8	79.9 80.3	4.05 3.71	3.97 3.71	5.4 4.9	8.7 6.6	7.8 6.3	0.8	0.8	3.6					4. Browning
23.0 12.8	83.1 80.4	4.01 3.64	3.88 3.64	5.8 5.3	8.6 6.7	7.5 6.2	1.6	2.4	7.8					5. Ephrata
24.9 13.1	83.7 81.7	3.85 3.67	3.78 3.67	6.0 5.5	8.8 6.7	7.7 6.3	0.8	0.8	2.8					6. Ephrata
26.7 14.3	83.4 81.9	3.94 3.59	3.69 3.59	6.5 5.8	8.9 6.8	7.6 6.3	1.2	2.4	9.0					7. Gozzi
25.3 14.4	84.7 84.3	3.50 3.28	3.42 3.28	7.6 6.9	8.0 6.4	7.5 6.4	0.8	0.8	2.8				4.8	8. Jaindl
24.2 13.6	83.0 82.0	3.88 3.65	3.81 3.65	6.3 6.0	8.8 6.7	7.5 6.8	0.8	0.8	2.8				2.3	9. Jerome
23.6 13.1	83.1 80.8	3.94 3.44	3.85 3.36	5.8 5.7	8.7 6.7	7.5 6.2	0.8	0.8	8.2				4.8	10. Jerome
24.2 12.7	84.5 81.5	3.62 3.58	3.60 3.58	6.2 5.6	8.4 6.5	7.4 6.1	1.6	2.4	3.4				4.5	11. Schultz
23.2 13.8	85.3 83.4	3.70 3.63	3.63 3.63	6.7 6.6	8.2 6.6	7.4 6.6	0.8	0.8	2.8				4.3	12. Shearer
15.0 9.0	80.5 79.6	3.50 3.80	3.44 3.67	5.9 5.2	7.1 5.7	6.3 5.5	0.8	0.8	6.6					13. Shearer
22.5 12.9	84.4 82.2	3.55 3.45	3.55 3.42	6.5 6.2	8.1 6.5	7.4 6.5	1.6	1.6	2.6			4.2	4.2	14. Tunnel
25.8 14.3	84.2 81.8	3.80 3.67	3.69 3.67	6.1 5.7	8.8 6.7	7.8 6.5	0.0	0.0	3.0				10.6	15. Williams
24.3 12.8	83.3 80.9	3.77 3.78	3.75 3.65	5.9 5.4	8.8 6.6	7.7 6.2	0.8	0.8	4.8				2.3	16. Williams
24.6 14.0	83.7 82.4	3.70 3.59	3.64 3.57	6.5 6.2	8.5 6.6	7.6 6.6	0.9	0.9	3.1			0.6	7.0	Avg. Bronze Entries
24.5 13.3	83.2 81.1	3.86 3.61	3.77 3.59	6.0 5.5	8.7 6.7	7.6 6.3	1.0	1.3	5.1			0.0	1.5	Avg. White Entries
24.5 13.6	83.4 81.7	3.78 3.60	3.71 3.58	6.3 5.8	8.6 6.6	7.6 6.5	0.9	1.1	4.2			0.3	4.1	Avg. All Entries

CENTRAL RANDOM SAMPLE TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TEST OF PENNSYLVANIA

Statistical Significance of Differences Between Entries

		Final Live Weight														
Entry No.	Toms	1	7	2	15	8	3	6	9	16	11	10	4	5	12	14
Entry No.	Hens	1	2	15	7	8	3	12	9	10	6	5	4	16	14	11
		Eviscerated Weight														
Entry No.	Toms	1	7	2	15	8	6	16	11	9	3	10	12	5	4	14
Entry No.	Hens	1	2	8	15	7	12	9	3	10	6	14	16	5	4	11
		Eviscerated Yield														
Entry No.	Toms	12	8	11	14	15	6	1	7	16	10	5	9	2	3	4
Entry No.	Hens	8	12	1	14	9	7	15	6	2	11	16	10	5	3	4
		Breast Width														
Entry No.	Toms	8	1	12	14	7	2	9	11	15	6	16	10	5	3	4
Entry No.	Hens	8	1	12	14	9	7	2	15	10	11	3	6	16	5	4
		Body Depth														
Entry No.	Toms	7	16	15	9	6	3	2	10	4	1	5	11	12	14	8
Entry No.	Hens	7	1	15	10	9	6	5	3	2	16	12	4	14	11	8
		Keel Length														
Entry No.	Toms	15	4	3	16	6	2	1	7	10	9	8	5	14	12	11
Entry No.	Hens	1	9	3	12	2	15	14	8	7	6	4	16	10	5	11



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
Agricultural Research Service  
Beltsville, Maryland 20705

Postage and Fees Paid  
U. S. Department of Agriculture

---

Official Business